

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-34 under 35 USC § 102(e). In view of the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections, and allowance of the subject Application.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct a typographical error contained therein. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected 1-34 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Perlman (USPN 5,583,576). Applicant has reviewed Perlman carefully and submits that Perlman does not disclose, teach or suggest any of the methods or devices claimed in claims 1-34. Although Applicant can understand how the Examiner could mistakenly consider Perlman to anticipate Applicant's claimed invention, a closure look at Perlman reveals that the claims of the present invention are directed to substantially different methods and devices than that considered or disclosed in Perlman. More particularly, in regard to claim 1, Perlman does not disclose, teach or suggest:

selecting a content-based specification;

selecting a finite time range specification associated with the
selected content-based specification;

comparing the selected content-based specification with received
content-based indicator when the reference time falls within the finite time
range specification; and

generating a control signal based on the comparison between the

selected content-based specification and the received content-based indicator.

as claimed in claim 1. In accordance with claim 1, selective supervision of personal exposure to a consumer electronics device is accomplished by automatically comparing the content of a program to a selected content-based specification during a specific time period and not comparing the content of the same program during a different time period. Although Perlman discusses comparing a program's rating to "predetermined content ratings" to determine whether or not to block the program, Perlman does not discuss or suggest including a provision for automatically turning on or off its blocking mechanism during a given time period or "interval." Perlman does refer to a "time interval," but merely in regard to storage in memory of program data for a given "time interval" from an electronic program guide (EPG). Perlman does not provide for or suggest a system or method in which a program is blocked or impaired if its content exceeds a selected content-based specification if a reference time falls within a selected time interval. Accordingly, claim 1, and claims 2-12 and 32-33 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1, meet the requirements for patentability under 35 USC § 102(e).

Turning to claim 13, Perlman does not disclose, teach or suggest:

selecting a first content-based rating;

selecting a first finite time range specification associated with the first content-based rating;

comparing the first selected content-based rating with the received content-based rating when the reference time falls within the first finite

time range specification; and

impairing the program signal if the received content-based rating

exceeds the first selected content-based rating.

as claimed in claim 13. In accordance with claim 13, selective supervision of personal exposure to a consumer electronics device is accomplished by automatically comparing the content of a program to a selected content-based specification during a specific time period and not comparing the content of the same program during a different time period, and, if during the specific time period the program content exceeds the selected content based specification, impairing the program signal. As noted above, Perlman discusses comparing a program's rating to "predetermined content ratings" to determine whether or not to block the program, but does not discuss or suggest including a provision for automatically turning on or off its blocking mechanism during a given time period or "interval." Perlman's reference to a "time interval" is in regard to storage of program data from an EPG for a given time period. Perlman does not discuss or suggest a system or method in which a program is blocked or impaired if its content exceeds a selected content-based specification for a specific time period. Accordingly, claim 13, and claims 14-18 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 13, meet the requirements for patentability under 35 USC § 102(e).

For the same reasons stated in regard to claim 1 above, Perlman fails to disclose, teach or suggest the steps of

selecting a content-based specification;

selecting a finite time range specification associated with the

selected content-based specification;

comparing the selected content-based specification with the
received content-based indicator when the reference time falls within the
finite time range specification; and

generating a control signal based on the comparison between the
selected content-based specification and the received content-based
indicator,

as claimed in claim 19. Accordingly, claim 19, and claims 20-24 by virtue of their
dependence upon claim 19, meet the requirements for patentability under 35 USC §
102(e).

Turning to claim 25, for the same reasons stated above in regard to claims 1, 13
and 19, Perlman fails to disclose, teach or suggest

a logic unit coupled to the non-volatile memory and being
configured for comparing a content-based indicator with the content-
based specification when a reference time falls within the finite time range
specification, the logic unit being further configured for generating a
control signal in response to the comparison between the content-based
indicator and the content-based specification;

as claimed in claim 25. Accordingly, claim 25, and claims 26-31 and 34 by virtue of
their dependence upon claim 25, meet the requirements for patentability under 35 USC
§ 102(e).

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow the application with the presently pending claims 1-34. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative at (949) 567-6700 ext. 7760, if the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview would advance this case to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 14, 2002

By:



Kenneth S. Roberts
Reg. No. 38, 283

KSR

Marked Version – Amended Specification

Page 2, lines 13-31

Fig. 2 shows a schematic drawing of the prior art "V-chip" system. A television or other display 30 is the ultimate recipient of display information. Initially, some source of information such as a television signal 32 is supplied from any number of sources, such as over-the-air transmission, cable or other recorded source. Channel selection 34 controls the tuner 36 to select the desired information from television signal 32. The output of tuner 36 is an audio/video signal 38 corresponding to the channel selected. A data slicer 40 is coupled to the output of the tuner 36. The data slicer 40 functions to monitor the [SCS] XDS signal as carried in the audio/video signal 38. The data slicer 40 may either strip the XDS signal from the audio/video signal 38 or simply duplicate the XDS signal. With the "V-chip" system, the XDS data obtained by the data slicer 40 is program rating information. The program rating information is supplied from the data slicer 40 to the comparator 42. A list 44 of prohibited ratings is stored or provided. Typically, the system would identify all prohibited ratings by level, such as R and X, though a system could utilize logic to prohibit any rating at a given level or above (the convention above meaning more mature or more likely to be prohibited). In the event of coincidence between the output of the data slicer 40 comprising the rating data of the program and the list of prohibited ratings 44, the comparator 42 provides a blocking signal 46 to signal blocking mechanism 48. The signal blocking mechanism 48 functions as a switch, blocking or otherwise

scrambling audio/video signal 38, such that the show having the prohibited rating is not displayed.